

Commission on Teacher Credentialing

***Meeting of
December 5-6, 2001***

AGENDA ITEM NUMBER: PREP - 2

COMMITTEE: Preparation Standards Committee

**TITLE: Issues and Options in the Preparation And Licensure of
K-12 Administrators**

_____ Action

X Information

_____ Report

Strategic Plan Goal(s):

**Goal 1: Promote educational excellence through the preparation and certification of
professional educators**

- Sustain high quality standards for the preparation of professional educators
- Sustain high quality standards for the performance of credential candidates

**Prepared By: _____
Mary Vixie Sandy
Director, Professional Services Division**

Date: _____

**Authorized By: _____
Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.
Executive Director**

Date: _____

Issues and Options in the Preparation And Licensure of K-12 Administrators

Professional Services Division

November 16, 2001

Executive Summary

In November 2001, the Commission was presented with a set of policy questions regarding the preparation and licensing of administrators. The intent of this session was to provide a broad policy context for the Commission to discuss the need for changes in administrator preparation and licensing. This report follows up on the November item and includes: 1) a summary of testimony received at the November Commission meeting; 2) a summary of the findings from a Task Force appointed by the Commission's Executive Director to examine the content and structure of the existing Administrative Services Credential; 3) a summary of administrator preparation and certification requirements in other states; and 4) the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders. The purpose of this report is to provide additional information to the Commission to inform a broad policy discussion of options for administrator preparation and licensure in the future.

Policy(s) Issue to be Considered

How should school administrators be prepared and licensed in California?

Fiscal Impact Statement

Activities related to the review and potential revision of this credential are covered under the Commission's base budget.

Issues and Options in the Preparation and Certification of K-12 Administrators

Professional Services Division

November 15, 2001

Background

In November 2001, the Commission was presented with a set of policy questions regarding the preparation and licensing of administrators. The intent of this session was to provide a broad policy context for the Commission to discuss the need for changes in administrator preparation and licensing. This report follows up on the November item and includes: 1) a summary of testimony received at the November Commission meeting; 2) a summary of the findings from a Task Force appointed by the Commission's Executive Director to examine the content and structure of the existing Administrative Services Credential; 3) a summary of administrator preparation and certification requirements in other states; and 4) the California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders.

The purpose of this report is to provide additional information to the Commission to inform a broad policy discussion of options for administrator preparation and licensure in the future.

Summary of Testimony Received at the November 2001 Commission Meeting

During the November 2001 Commission meeting, more than twenty individuals, representing an array of groups and perspectives, provided testimony to the Commission regarding eight broad policy questions. The November 2001 minutes contain a lengthy summary of those remarks, which are synthesized below.

Policy Question One: What does the 21st Century school require in terms of management at each level?

- Schools and districts face a crisis of both quantity and quality of school leaders, largely because leaders feel unsupported in taking on a daunting job.
- A record number of administrators are burning out and leaving the profession.
- Not all of the problems of administrator capacity are due to training, many are related to the responsibilities of the job itself as well as the associated levels of compensation (or lack of compensation).
- The current content, delivery and structure of administrator preparation can create a barrier to talented candidates entering school management

Policy Question Two: Which school management positions should require a credential?

- A school principal's focus is very different from the other positions covered in Tier 1.
- Many states that have separate principal credentials, and even different ones for different levels of school.
- People who are curriculum coordinators, staff development experts, or child welfare providers need specialized training but they don't need full administrative credential training.

Policy Question Three: What should be the content of administrator preparation?

- The most effective training and preparation for school site leaders is linked to the work of the district and the school including the ability to mentor new leaders within the district.
- The credential should be structured around on-the-job training versus seat time in a university.
- Flexibility is necessary in any training because not all jobs require the same skill sets. Training should be needs-driven for the individual.
- The new California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL), developed under the auspices of the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) and the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), represent the best current thinking from the field regarding appropriate content in administrator preparation.

Policy Question Four: Which entities should be authorized to provide administrator preparation?

- Partnerships between universities and school districts and non-profit training organizations. Provide choice in programs for those who do not currently have easy access to universities.
- Academies focused on training only principals and assistant principals, who serve an apprenticeship for a year.
- Allow districts to grow their own administrators. Districts should be able to collaborate to create their own programs, as long as they meet standards.

Policy Question Five: Which decisions about administrator preparation should be left to local school districts to decide?

- Districts should have maximum flexibility to hire and place administrators within the K-12 system.

Policy Question Six: What should the structure of administrator preparation involve?

- A single unified credential (no Tier 1 and Tier II) that prepares candidates to do the job without deferring additional classes to later training.
- Support a standards based credential based on the California Professional Standards for Leaders.
- Completion of the credential through demonstrated competencies, rather than by clock hours.
- Candidates should be allowed to challenge standards and fast track through the system if they believe they have the necessary knowledge and ability.
- Provide ongoing support for new administrators including induction, mentoring and on-going professional development

The final two policy questions were not addressed in public testimony, but are reprinted below.

Policy Question Seven: What does an appropriate “learning to lead” continuum look like for school and district administrators?

Policy Question Eight: What is an appropriate accountability system for administrator preparation programs?

Summary of Findings from the Executive Director’s Task Force

Growing concerns about the effectiveness of administrator preparation and licensure led the Commission’s Executive Director to appoint a Task Force to conduct a focused review of the Administrative Services Credential. A series of public forums held during the winter of 2001 provided an opportunity for interaction on these issues among stakeholders, including existing administrators, administrators in training, higher education faculty and administration, parents and business community representatives. Participants discussed the current structure of the Administrative Services Credential, the content of professional preparation programs, the need for induction and support for new administrators, alternative program options, and recruitment and retention of site and district office administrative positions.

Field Forum Findings. Forum participants discussed what is working well, what is not working well and made suggestions for improvement in the overall system of administrator preparation and licensure. Common themes emerging from the forums included the following:

- The credential structure should ensure that all new administrators receive support, mentoring and assistance during the early years of employment as an administrator.
- The new administrator is so heavily involved with the demands of their new position that additional course requirements for the second tier (Professional level Credential) are difficult to complete and in many cases duplicative and irrelevant.
- Alternative delivery systems should be developed to facilitate the recruitment and training of administrators in “hard to staff” schools or to help districts “grow their own” administrators.
- The current structure of the Administrative Services Credential may also be a barrier that discourages individuals from applying for an administrative position.
- The second tier (Professional) Credential needs to be drastically redesigned or eliminated.
- There is a need for better dialogue between institutions that prepare administrators and employing school districts.

- There is often redundancy in content between the Preliminary and Professional levels of credential preparation.
- Field experiences during preliminary preparation are often offered part time because candidates are not able to obtain release time to participate more extensively. Thus many administrators do not get an adequate sense of the scope of administrative responsibilities prior to employment.
- There needs to be a better blend between theory and practice.
- The content of preliminary preparation needs to be updated to better reflect the current demands of administration.
- The content of professional development after employment of an administrator needs to be monitored by the employing school district.

Field Survey Findings. In addition to holding public forums, the Executive Director directed staff to join with faculty at California State University, Stanislaus to conduct a survey of recent graduates of administrator preparation programs. The survey focussed on the perceptions of recent graduates regarding the adequacy of their preparation for the role of administration. Approximately 7500 surveys were sent to candidates completing Administrative Services Credential programs over the past three years. Of the 7500 sent out, 2468 were completed and returned, 532 were undeliverable and 130 completed surveys were returned after the deadline. Respondents written comments were consistent with the themes emerging from the Commission sponsored forums.

The issues primarily identified by the respondents indicated that the graduates were pleased with the structure of the current Tier I credential process being provided at the universities, but they were very clear that the current format of Tier II must be overhauled. Although 1655 of the 2500 graduates surveyed are working in positions which require an Administrative Services credential, 63% of those respondents indicated they should be enrolled in a Tier II program, but aren't for a variety of reasons. Many graduates referenced their participation in ACSA and/or CSLA Academies as a very positive experience.

Task Force Findings. The Executive Director's Task Force met nine times during 2001. Early meetings were largely devoted to gaining the necessary background to approach the job. Members attended the field forums and reviewed a considerable amount of information during the course of their work.

The major topics studied by the Task Force were the efficacy of the current standards for the Administrative Services Credential, the efficacy of the current credential structure and the alignment of the existing standards with national standards. Specific findings in each of these areas are listed below.

Administrator Preparation Standards

The Task Force has studied the Commission's *Standards of Quality and Effectiveness for Administrative Services Credential Programs*, the national Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) *Standards for School Leaders* and the *California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL)s* developed through a collaborative effort sponsored by ACSA and CSLA. Based on the study of these standards, the Task Force determined that the current CCTC candidate competence standards are compatible with the ISLLC standards as well as the CPSEL standards. Commission staff participated in the development of both of these sets of standards. Further, it was noted the CPSEL standards are also very closely aligned with the ISLLC standards but better represent comprehensive professional based standards of practice for California because they were developed with specific attention to current the needs of California's schools and students.

Structure of the Administrative Services Credential

The Task Force found that the Administrative Services Credential, as it is currently structured, does not work well for the preparation and licensing of administrators. Survey results and testimony received during the public forums support the need for initial preparation completed before beginning employment as an administrator. The Task Force suggests that upon initial employment as an administrator, the new administrator receive the Professional Credential with a five year renewal requirement, as is current practice. The Task Force suggests that the Executive Director consider requiring that the first renewal period (1) be guided by a Professional Leadership Plan based on the CPSEL standards, (2) include two years of administrative experience, and (3) include support and assistance, professional learning activities, and a final assessment. Subsequent renewals under this scenario would be granted with the completion of the Commission's existing professional growth requirements.

Initial Preparation

The Task Force found that initial preparation could be strengthened by incorporating the following features:

- All preparation programs would meet the Commission's program standards that will be based upon and aligned with the CPSEL standards.
- Specific curriculum that would be updated in initial preparation includes focused attention on California's Academic Content Standards for Students, assessment and accountability. The programs would also provide enhanced curricula related to special education and pupil services issues.
- Program requirements would include field experiences that are practical (translating theory into practice), meaningful, realistic (recognizing time commitments), job embedded

(providing credit for "hands-on" experiences), and, as much as possible accomplished during the school day. Field experiences would involve qualified site/district level field experience supervisors.

- Near the end of initial preparation, the candidate would complete a culminating assessment based on the CPSEL standards to measure the achievement of candidate outcomes. The assessment would determine the candidate's eligibility for the credential. This experience would also include an updated self-assessment/needs assessment to begin the candidate's own Professional Leadership Plan. This culminating assessment would establish the basis for the individual candidate's ongoing professional learning.
- The internship program option available under current law would continue to be available to provide a useful alternative preparation structure geared to the specific needs of school districts. Administrative internship programs may be established by school districts or colleges and universities. However, these programs would be joint projects of the districts and preparing institutions. The internship option is a specific pathway available to allow districts to "grow your own" administrators. The task force did not favor a solely "district-based" internship that was not a partnership. A major reason was the recognition that the credential is for service in the entire state and that a solely "district-based" program might not provide sufficient diversity in preparation.

First Renewal

The Administrative Services Task Force found first renewal could be strengthened by incorporating the following:

- Program sponsors for the first renewal requirements could include education agencies (LEAs – school districts and county offices of education), education and professional organizations or institutions of higher education, or collaborations among them and would be approved by the CCTC. The purpose of the "sponsor" would be to ensure that the Professional Leadership Plan is developed with the required elements (plan, support and assistance, professional learning, and assessment) and to set up a delivery system for its implementation. This would be implemented in the context of a single employing agency and/or in collaboration with institutions of higher education, county offices of education, or other education and professional organizations. The sponsor would recoup the necessary resources to implement the program by charging candidates, applying for state and/or federal funds as available or charging the employing district. Not all Task Force members were in agreement with this suggestion. Some felt colleges and universities should continue to be the program sponsors.
- The local education agency and new administrator would be responsible for ensuring that the Professional Leadership Plan based upon the CPSELs is initiated within ninety days of initial employment. The plan would be based on the culminating assessment completed

near the end of initial preparation. The Professional Leadership Plan would include the following: individual professional learning goals, an identified support provider, mentored activities, and an ongoing assessment plan based on the Professional Leadership Plan goals. Both the district and the new administrator would identify areas of expectation for the employee based upon individual and district needs. Together, they would also identify support and assistance resources available. The individualized Professional Leadership Plan would be ongoing throughout the term of the credential and would go with the candidate when changing employers. The Professional Leadership Plan would be modified during the term of the credential as changing circumstances might require.

- The initial renewal of the credential would require a minimum of two years of successful full-time employment as an administrator.
- Those individuals providing support and assistance for the new administrators would be qualified, skilled, knowledgeable about the CPSEL standards, California Academic Content Standards for Students, the Professional Leadership Plan and the credentialing process. Ideally, support providers would not be responsible for the employee's evaluation. It is important to recognize the confidential nature of the process of providing support and assistance. Support providers would assist with ongoing planning of the Professional Leadership Plan and guide the candidate toward continuous improvement. The new administrator would be expected to engage in reflective practice with her/his support provider building upon the foundation of initial preparation, to apply earlier experiences to the job. Initially, the support provider would be assisting the new administrator in the challenges of the new administrative assignment. As appropriate, the efforts would then be more directed toward the professional learning of the administrator. Support providers would be recognized for their work.
- Opportunities for a variety of professional learning activities would be based on the individual's Professional Leadership Plan. They would include but not be limited to district provided opportunities such as staff development, coursework and/or seminars, workshops, and support groups. In addition, there are activities such as ACSA academies, CSLA seminars, college and university coursework and other external professional development experiences. Administrators in this phase of professional development would demonstrate growth related to the CPSELs over time through various assessment activities and interaction with the support providers as they gain more in-depth knowledge and skills in their job experiences. There would be a final assessment/external review process prior to the recommendation of the program sponsor for the initial renewal of the credential. Task Force members were almost evenly divided on this issue. Some felt the nature and extent of the professional learning should be specific with regards to the required number of hours. A slight majority favored the view that this should be decided at the local level.

Subsequent Renewals

The Task Force recognizes that the Commission already has established requirements for subsequent credential renewals of the Administrative Services Credential with the 150 hours of on-going professional growth requirement under current Commission policies. The Task Force found that this process could be improved by administrators remaining responsible for their own professional growth, with ongoing self-directed revisions of the Professional Leadership Plan based upon the CPSELs.

The next section of this report provides information on administrator preparation and certification requirements in other states. California's requirements are summarized in the final table in this section.

Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
Illinois	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Board of Education in consultation with the State Teacher Certification Board sets standards.</p> <p>State Board of Education accredits programs.</p>	<p>Administrative Certificate is divided into four areas of “endorsement” for different types of administrator:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. General Supervisory (supervisors, curriculum directors) 2. General Administrative (principal, vice principal, associate superintendent) 3. Chief School Business Official 4. Superintendent 	For all endorsements with the exception of principal or assistant principal: MA; 5 years experience; pass basic skills and admin. content area exam; intensive coursework in education management, governance, organization and planning; full-time administrative position for one year; comprehensive assessment of performance assessment and recommendation for certification.
Indiana	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Professional Standards Board (specifically for Ed. licensing) write and approve standards. Currently have new draft standards based on the new NCATE standards for administrators.</p> <p>State Professional Standards Board accredits jointly with NCATE.</p>	<p>Currently have 8 authorizations: Elementary, Secondary, Superintendent, General Supervisor and Curriculum Specialist, Director of Reading, Director of School Services Personnel, Director of Special Ed., Director of Vocational Ed.</p> <p>Proposed framework to be considered by State Professional Standards Board and implemented in July 2002 will offer only 2 authorizations: District Administrator and Building Level Administrator.</p>	Not for Administrative Certification.

Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements, continued

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
Massachusetts	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Department of Education sets standards.</p> <p>State Department of Education accredits (no program approval required for induction phase, rely on districts to implement them).</p>	<p>There are 5 licenses for administrators:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Superintendent (and Assistant) 2. School Principal (and Assistant) 3. Supervisor/Director 4. Special Ed. Administrator 5. School Business Administrator <p>Each license has an Initial License and a Professional license. Generally the Professional license requires experience in the position, an induction program and recommendation based on completion of a performance assessment, or completion of an advanced program of studies, or completion of a professional portfolio accepted by the Department.</p>	<p>Massachusetts is currently implementing new regulations (effective 10/01/01) that were modified to take into account: 1) the various alternative routes to licensure, and 2) efforts to attract new candidates to the teaching profession (and administrative roles within).</p> <p>New regulations provide for experience and demonstration of competencies to satisfy licensure requirements as long as they satisfy the standards.</p> <p>Allows requirements for all licenses to be waived, with the exception of a passing score on the communication and literacy test (ELL test administered by NES), for candidates with significant managerial experience who meet the standards through both their experience and their formal education.</p>
Michigan	Not for licensure. Only for on-going professional development for renewal (6 semester hours, or 18 hours of State Board Continuing Education.	<p>Local school districts set standards.</p> <p>No accreditation for administrator preparation necessary. Local districts may require certain coursework that could be accredited.</p>	Local school districts determine all policies and procedures related to administrative certification.	Not applicable.

Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements, continued

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
South Carolina	Yes, specific to education, training and experience.	<p>State Department of Education, Division of Teacher Quality – Office of Teacher Certification (set to adopt new standards based on NCATE draft administrator standards)</p> <p>State department of Education (division separate and distinct from certification) in conjunction with NCATE.</p>	<p>Administrative Certificate is divided into 4 areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Administrator 2. Elementary Principal and Supervisor 3. Secondary School Principal and Supervisor 4. School Superintendent 	<p>Administrator and Superintendent allow candidates to substitute a Master's Degree, additional coursework in administration, a qualifying score on an nationally recognized approved administrator examination (Praxis II) and work experience in the field for program of administrator or superintendent preparation.</p> <p>Every candidate for school principal must complete the Principal Assessment Center (they are reviewed and get diagnostic feedback that becomes part of their professional development program prior to appointment as a principal.)</p>

Administrator Preparation/Certification Requirements, continued

	State Requirements?	Who Sets Standards and Accredits Programs?	Levels of Certification?	Alternative Paths to Certification?
California	Yes, specific to education, training and experience	Commission On Teacher Credentialing develops standards and accredits institutions that offer programs.	<p>Administrative Services Credential authorizes service at both the school site and district level and is required for individuals responsible for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development, coordination and assessment of instructional programs and student support services (supervision of); • Recruitment, supervision, evaluation and discipline of certificated and classified personnel; • Student discipline; • School site management, district, or county level fiscal services. <p>Preliminary (Tier 1) Credential - Requires a valid CA teaching credential completion of a program of profession preparation in administrative services or a one-year administrative services internship and three years in public schools.</p> <p>Professional (Tier 2) Credential – Requires valid Preliminary Admin. Credential, two years in administrative position, completion (and recommendation from) of an individualized program of advanced preparation designed in cooperation with employer and the college or university.</p>	Principal Training Program (AB 75, 2001) authorizes local education agencies to provide professional development that could satisfy some or all of the requirements for the Professional Credential.

California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders

The Association of California School Administrators (ACSA) and the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) recently collaborated on a standards development process that resulted in the development of new California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSELs). These standards are based on standards developed at the National level by the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium which are used to guide preparation and certification in a number of other states. ACSA and CSLA convened a broadly representative group that included Commission staff to review the ISLLC standards and customize them for use in California. The results of this collaboration are presented below.

California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders

Preamble

The administrator at a school site has numerous responsibilities that ultimately lead to the improvement of the performance of all students in the school. By acquiring the skills, attitudes, and behaviors as outlined in the following professional standards for educational leaders, students have the best opportunity to achieve the mission and vision of the district and to meet the expectations of high standards for student learning. Inherent in these standards is a strong commitment to cultural diversity and the use of technology as a powerful tool.

Standard 1

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

- Facilitate the development of a shared vision for the achievement of all students based upon data from multiple measures of student learning and relevant qualitative indicators.
- Communicate and implement the shared vision so that the entire school community understands and acts on the mission of the school as a standards-based educational system.
- Leverage and marshal sufficient resources to implement and attain the vision for all students and subgroups of students.
- Identify and address any barriers to accomplishing the vision.
- Shape school programs, plans, and activities to ensure integration, articulation, and consistency with the vision.
- Use the influence of diversity to improve teaching and learning.

Standard 2

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.

- Create an accountability system of teaching and learning based on student learning standards.
- Utilize multiple assessment measures to evaluate student learning to drive an ongoing process of inquiry focused on improving the learning of all students and all subgroups of students.
- Shape a culture where high expectations for all students and for all subgroups of students is the core purpose.
- Guide and support the long-term professional development of all staff consistent with the ongoing effort to improve the learning of all students relative to the content standards.
- Promote equity, fairness, and respect among all members of the school community.
- Provide opportunities for all members of the school community to develop and use skills in collaboration, leadership, and shared responsibility.
- Facilitate the use of appropriate learning materials and learning strategies which include the following: students as active learners, a variety of appropriate materials and strategies, the use of reflection and inquiry, an emphasis on quality versus quantity, and appropriate and effective technology.

Standard 3

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.

- Monitor and evaluate the programs and staff at the site.
- Establish school structures, patterns, and processes that support student learning.
- Manage legal and contractual agreements and records in ways that foster a professional work environment and secure privacy and confidentiality for all students and staff.
- Align fiscal, human, and material resources to support the learning of all students and all groups of students.
- Sustain a safe, efficient, clean, well-maintained, and productive school environment that nurtures student learning and supports the professional growth of teachers and support staff.
- Utilize the principles of systems management, organizational development, problem solving, and decision-making techniques fairly and effectively.
- Utilize effective and nurturing practices in establishing student behavior management systems.

Standard 4

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.

- Incorporate information about family and community expectations into school decision making and activities.
- Recognize the goals and aspirations of diverse family and community groups.
- Treat diverse community stakeholder groups with fairness and with respect.
- Support the equitable success of all students and all subgroups of students through the mobilization and leveraging of community support services.
- Strengthen the school through the establishment of community, business, institutional, and civic partnerships.
- Communicate information about the school on a regular and predictable basis through a variety of media and modes.

Standard 5

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by modeling a personal code of ethics and developing professional leadership capacity.

- Demonstrate skills in decision making, problem solving, change management, planning, conflict management, and evaluation.
- Model personal and professional ethics, integrity, justice, and fairness and expect the same behaviors from others.
- Make and communicate decisions based upon relevant data and research about effective teaching and learning, leadership, management practices, and equity.
- Reflect on personal leadership practices and recognize their impact and influence on the performance of others.
- Encourage and inspire others to higher levels of performance, commitment, and motivation.
- Sustain personal motivation, commitment, energy, and health by balancing professional and personal responsibilities.
- Engage in professional and personal development.
- Demonstrate knowledge of the curriculum and the ability to integrate and articulate programs throughout the grades.
- Use the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain.
- Protect the rights and confidentiality of students and staff.

Standard 6

A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

- View oneself as a leader of a team and also a member of a larger team.
- Ensure that the school operates consistently within the parameters of federal, state, and local laws, policies, regulations, and statutory requirements.
- Generate support for the school by two-way communication with key decision makers in the school community.
- Work with the governing board and district and local leaders to influence policies that benefit students and support the improvement of teaching and learning.
- Influence and support public policies that ensure the equitable distribution of resources, and support for all the subgroups of students.
- Open the school to the public and welcome and facilitate constructive conversations about how to improve student learning and achievement.

Standards 1-4 and 6 are from Council of Chief State School Officers, Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium: Standards for School Leaders. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 1996, pp. 10, 12, 14, 16, and 20. Standard 5 is adapted from this same source, p. 18. Elements are from representatives from the California School Leadership Academy at WestEd, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, Association of California School Administrators, Professional Development Consortia, California Department of Education, and California colleges and universities, California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders, April 17, 2001 (draft).